

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE A1NEW YORK TIMES  
19 November 1986

# SHULTZ REPORTED TO SEEK FIRM HALT TO ARMS FOR IRAN

## WANTS A REAGAN PLEDGE

### Accounts Differ on Whether Secretary Makes Cutoff a Condition for Staying

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18 — Secretary of State George P. Shultz has asked President Reagan for a firm commitment not to provide more military equipment to Iran and to agree that future diplomatic contacts with Teheran have State Department participation, Administration officials said today.

There were conflicting accounts of whether Mr. Shultz had presented his requests as conditions for his staying in the Administration.

Some officials said today that they were told that Mr. Shultz had told the President that unless those requests were honored, there might not be any sense in his serving much longer in the Administration. But a senior White House official said Mr. Reagan had indicated to him that Mr. Shultz had not threatened to quit.

#### Talked on the Weekend

According to some officials, Mr. Shultz made the requests last Saturday at Camp David, Md. Mr. Shultz said on Sunday that he had "talked" with Mr. Reagan about resigning, but he would not reveal his exact comments to the President.

On Monday, Mr. Reagan and the White House spokesman, Larry Speakes, both said there were no plans for future military shipments to Iran. This was viewed by Mr. Shultz's aides as a positive response by the White

House to the Secretary's request on arms shipments and a sign of Mr. Reagan's desire that Mr. Shultz remain in office.

Nothing has been said, however, of the second request, that the State Department be included in future discussions on Iran.

#### 'No Urgency'

But a White House official said there was "no urgency" because "the whole thing is on hold anyway." He said that the publicity of the last two weeks about the secret contacts had closed down the Iranian connection.

Mr. Shultz's future came up again at briefings for reporters at the White House and the State Department. Mr. Speakes said today that Mr. Reagan did not want Mr. Shultz to resign. And the State Department spokesman, Charles E. Redman, refused again today to go beyond what Mr. Shultz said on Sunday on the CBS News program "Face the Nation" when he raised the possibility of resigning.

It was not clear whether Mr. Reagan would actually cancel all or part of the directive that he signed last Jan. 17 authorizing the National Security Council staff to take the lead in establishing secret contacts with Iran.

The directive said the purpose of the secret opening was to see if Iran's behavior could be moderated and the release of American hostages in Lebanon be obtained. To those ends, it authorized the shipment of limited amounts of defensive weapons and spare parts to Iran, despite the public embargo on such equipment.

#### Waiting for 'Developments'

On Monday, Mr. Speakes said that the directive of Jan. 17 had not been canceled but that no arms would be sent until there were "more positive developments" in Iran's policies. Whether this would satisfy Mr. Shultz was uncertain.

Mr. Shultz's opposition to the sale of additional military equipment to Iran was made public Sunday during the television interview, in which he said that although he was against such sales he could not say if that was the policy of the Administration.

On Monday night, during a question-and-answer session in Chicago after delivering a speech, Mr. Shultz spoke out again on that theme. He said he believed the public discussion had "reinforced" the previous policy of not dealing for hostages.

"It's a mistake for government to get into the business of trading something of genuine importance for hostages," he said. "Why? Not because you don't want to get the hostages back. And, I suppose, not really because you care that much about a little dough-rem-e, but because if you do that, all you do is encouraging the taking of more hostages and you put more Americans at risk."

"So that's the theory," he said. "I think it's a perfectly good theory, and it's a good practice, and we intend to stick to it."

Mr. Shultz's concern about the involvement of the State Department in future diplomatic contacts with Iran stemmed from his reported unhappiness with the way he and his top aides were deprived of critical information about the secret contacts held with Iranians, including the mission by Robert C. McFarlane, the former national security adviser, to Teheran last May.

Mr. McFarlane was accompanied by Lieut. Col. Oliver North of the National Security Council staff, who, like Mr. McFarlane, has no particular expertise in Iranian affairs.

A White House official said a senior Central Intelligence Agency official with expertise in Iran went along on the McFarlane mission as the interpreter and as the senior adviser on Iranian affairs. No State Department official was included, he said, because of Mr. Shultz's opposition to the operation and because of a fear of news leaks.

Mr. Shultz, alluding to his concerns, said Monday night that "there's a lot about what transpired that I don't know about."

"So I'm not able to comment in detail," he said.

He said there was "wide agreement" on the value of finding out if there was a chance that Iran might shift its policies. But he said the need for secrecy had its drawbacks, and this, he said, consisted of not being able "to take advantage of the checks and the balance and the expertise, and so on, that exists."

A State Department official said the reference to "expertise" was Mr. Shultz's way of pointing up his criticism of the way that the mission was run by the White House national security adviser, Vice Adm. John M. Poindexter.

Referring to his hope that Mr. Reagan would accept his recommendations, Mr. Shultz said that "I'm sure that we will somehow be able to organize ourselves if opportunities arise to explore that."

Continued

State Department officials said Mr. Shultz had not asked that Admiral Poindexter be replaced, and Mr. Speakes said today that Mr. Reagan wanted Admiral Poindexter to remain.

**Reagan News Conference Tonight**

Mr. Reagan is expected to be asked many questions about Iran during a scheduled news conference on Wednesday night at 8.

Mr. Speakes, asked if Mr. Reagan was annoyed with Mr. Shultz for being outspoken, said, "No, he's not."

Other White House officials have said that some aides were unhappy with Mr. Shultz's independent approach on the Iran situation.